**Workgroup Members:**

Deb Klenotic, PA DEP (Lead)

Adrianna Berk (Tetra Tech)

Irina Calos, VA DEQ

Rachel Felver, ACB/CBP

Jennifer Greiner, USFWS/CBP

Rachel Hamm, VA DEQ

Phil Miller, DNREC

Kristin Reilly, CCWC

Natalia Sanchez, UMD-EFC

Joan Smedinghoff, ACB/CBP

Jennifer Starr, ACB/Local Leadership Workgroup

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**ACTION:** VA DEQ will identify what their needs to drive the need for this graphic.

**ACTION:** Reach out to Local Leadership Workgroup on how to help get the word out to the relevant audiences about co-benefits? How do we find the right spokespeople to do this?

**ACTION:** Rachel will share Caitlyn’s local association spreadsheet with the group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2:00 – 2:05 | **Welcome and Roll Call*** Deb Klenotic started off the call by recapping that our first few calls were used to take stock of communications that were already being generated to help drive engagement in the Phase III WIP planning process.
 |
|  |  |
| 2:05 – 2:25 | **States’ WIP3 Communication Needs** * From these discussions three main communications needs surfaced:
	+ Increase the awareness of local WIP planners of the 12 co-benefits fact sheets, and co-benefits in general.
		- There is a strong need to help educate local stakeholders into building these into the WIP planning process.
	+ The creation of a dashboard or other digital location for local stakeholders to see their progress in achieving their nutrient and sediment pollution reductions. It would assist in seeing the positive community outcomes related to those reductions.
	+ Communication related to funding sources.
* Anything else out there that this group has heard/experienced as a gap related to Phase III WIP planning?
* Deb Klenotic: PA WIP planners are interested in receiving help on communicating funding and increasing the value of co-benefits of BMPs, but do not need the assistance on dashboards at this time. We have created a Healthy Waters, Healthy Communities blog series to champion the efforts of county planners in planning their Phase III WIPs. Will be shared on social media, along with targeted advertisements.
* Irina Calos: One issue we could use help on is how do we communicate the actual data in the Phase III WIPs – we’d love to use infographics, but we aren’t graphic designers. Could we mimic the LGEI river graphic?
	+ Rachel Felver: Tetra Tech created that graphic and we can discuss whether they can create something similar that can be customizable for all jurisdictions.

**ACTION:** VA DEQ will identify what their needs to drive the need for this graphic. |
|  |  |
| 2:25 – 2:55 | **Engaging WIP3 Local Planners in BMP Co-Benefits**Communications strategy/tools we can contribute to raise local stakeholders’ knowledge and use of the [12 co-benefits of BMPs](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/programs/watershed_implementation) in developing their plans and building buy-in.* Jennifer Greiner attended an event on the Delmarva in regard to landscape level conservation in early November and mentioned the co-benefit fact sheets. The group was very interested.
* Phil Miller: Our biggest struggle has been with our local government stakeholders. We sent out initial mailing and are planning on having a spring workshop – but what is the specific ask we are making of them in regard to the co-benefits? We can share the fact sheets, but not sure what the specific ask is. Can that be outlined in a simple way?
	+ Kristin Reilly: I will re-share the one-page jurisdictional engagement strategies that Choose Clean Water developed.
	+ Jennifer Greiner: The co-benefits fact sheets and PPT are helpful – but talking points or a simple postcard as to why we should consider co-benefits would be helpful. It should be linked to local governments, tying it in with the themes that resonate the most with them, economic benefits, agricultural info, etc.
* How do we help local stakeholders see the value of co-benefits? Are these co-benefits seen as a good persuasion tool?
	+ Jennifer Greiner: Yes, if it speaks to what appeals to the local decision makers (economic development, quality of life, etc.).
* Kristin Reilly: Choose Clean Water has partnered with the UMD Environmental Finance Center to outline (MD only for now) success stories on stormwater BMPs. We also have been working with Water Words that Work to train partners on how to best use those one-pagers in a meeting. Could we potentially continue those trainings through this action team? There is probably a lot of material that people already have and we don’t need to create anything new.
* Deb Klenotic: Can this action team help in connecting with the right people to get the word out about co-benefits? Who are these people? We need to equip them with this material in a way they could communicate it to their local stakeholders.
	+ Jennifer Greiner: Who are the intermediary translator groups? They need to take CBP knowledge and carry it to the local stakeholders.
	+ Deb Klenotic: Can the co-benefit materials get in the mouths of spokespeople to get the word out? How do we get the people in the right room, and communicating with the right people? Can the action team do this?
	+ Kristin Reilly: Who is bringing that message to the local governments?

**ACTION:** Reach out to Local Leadership Workgroup on how to help get the word out to the relevant audiences about co-benefits? How do we find the right spokespeople to do this?**ACTION:** Rachel will share Caitlyn’s local association spreadsheet with the group.* Deb Klenotic: Could this group partner with the Local Leadership Workgroup to offer a behavior change campaign to match up with people identified by the Local Leadership Workgroup, Caitlyn’s spreadsheet and identified jurisdictional WIP planning leads?
* Rachel Felver: What is the behavior we want to target?
	+ Deb Klenotic: Getting folks to build co-benefits into their WIPs.
* Jennifer Starr: It would be a great idea for the Local Leadership Workgroup to partner with this group. LGAC said the fact sheets are too technical. It’s great info for senior staff – not elected officials. Have the jurisdictions used them and shared them?
	+ Deb Klenotic: They’ve been used slightly, but we need to use them more.
	+ Jennifer Starr: Are additional fact sheets being planned?
	+ Rachel Felver: No, not at this time.
* Deb Klenotic: What are the local values for each jurisdiction?
	+ Rachel Felver: We need states to help brainstorm that.
* Jennifer Starr: Management Board requested that the Local Leadership Workgroup come back and have a conversation at the January meeting on the creation of an over-arching strategy on what outcomes need support with outreach to local governments. How can the Comm WG help with this strategy?
	+ Deb Klenotic: We can do one or two things quickly – like create the co-benefits postcard. How do we create conversations in stakeholder meetings to help communicate the value of co-benefits? This would take a bit more time.
 |
| 2:55 – 3:00 | **Live Webinar on WIP3 Planning for States**Are we interested in creating a live webinar for state WIP3 leaders to share their successes, ideas, challenges, and questions to date in engaging local stakeholders in planning? * Deb Klenotic: Can this group organize a webinar for leadership in all of the jurisdictions on Phase III WIP engagement? Invite them to participate and discuss what’s working with them, can we share any materials, etc.
	+ Rachel Hamm: We are all at different phases of the WIP. VA is already almost done, and we’ve found it was very successful to go through our planning district commissions.
 |
|  |  |

**Potential topics for future meetings:**

* Dashboard presentations from Adrianna Berk and Emily Trentecoste.
* Lessons learned from Virginia on their WIP engagement.
* How can this action team accomplish requests from Local Leadership Workgroup to assist with the local government engagement strategy? What can we do and when? Who can we partner with?

**Next meeting:** Tuesday, December 18, 2018 from 2:00 – 3:00 p.m.